

3. Review of Moderate and Major Property Specific Requests

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
ALPINE						
AL24	VR2	VR2.9 (Moderate)	VR2	VR2.9 / RL20 (Minor)	The request was for an increase in density that was not evaluated in the EIR and, therefore, considered a Moderate level of change category. A potential alternative would be to increase the density on the more developable portion of the site near the access road while decreasing the density on the rest of the parcel so that there isn't a substantial change in overall density.	4-3
AL27	VR2	VR2.9 (Moderate)	VR2	none	This request for an increase in density was not evaluated in the EIR and, therefore, is a Moderate level of change. An alternative similar to AL24 was considered, but AL27 is more constrained and the developable portion of the site is adjacent to a two-acre lot neighborhood to the south. Therefore, an alternative similar to AL24 is not recommended for this property.	N/A
BONSALL						
BO3-A	SR10	SR2 (Major)	SR2	SR4 (Minor)	The request of SR2 is not supported by the project objectives due to the significant farmland, high quality habitat, and steep slopes found onsite. Because of these characteristics, the project site is different than the surrounding area that has designations of SR1 and SR2. The surrounding designations of SR1 and SR2 reflect existing parcelization that occurred from development decades ago. A potential alternative would be SR4, which was evaluated in the EIR and was the staff recommendation prior to the Planning Commission recommendation of SR10. The density of 1du/4ac is considered appropriate for maintaining commercial agricultural operations, whereas a density of 1du/2ac would likely result in more substantial conversion of agricultural lands.	4-4, 5-25 to 5-27
BO18	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	SR10	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
BO20	SR10	SR2 (Major)	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	The property is surrounded by SR10. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because the site and surrounding areas contain significant agricultural lands. A alternative designation of SR4 is possible for this and the surrounding area, but is more intensive than any alternative in the EIR. [Combined with BO29 and BO33]	4-5

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
BO21	SR2	General Commercial (Moderate)	SR2	Residential Commercial Zoning (Minor)	The SR2 designation is the only designation that was analyzed for this site; therefore, a General Commercial designation would require EIR revision and recirculation. A potential alternative would be to apply the Residential Commercial zone within the SR2 designation. Residential Commercial zoning allows for limited commercial use types in combination with residential uses.	4-6
BO22	SR10/RL40	SR4/RL40 (Moderate)	SR10/RL40	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. The property owner suggested that a possible Minor alternative would be to designate only the northern portion of the property as SR4. However, this does not address the fact that the highest density considered for the site in the EIR was SR10. Additionally, if any portion of the site is designated as SR4, similar consideration should be given to the similar properties surrounding this property and a larger change to SR4 may be necessary for consistent treatment.	N/A
BO29	SR10	SR2 (Moderate)	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	The property is surrounded by SR10. The request of SR2 was incorrectly listed as a Moderate change and should be a Major level of change because it would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model since the site and surrounding areas contain significant agricultural lands. An alternative designation of SR4 is possible for this and the surrounding area but is more intensive than any alternative in the EIR. [Combined with BO20 and BO33]	4-5
BO32	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	SR10	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
BO33	SR10	SR2 (Major)	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	The property is surrounded by SR10. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because the site and surrounding areas contain significant agricultural lands. An alternative designation of SR4 is possible for this and the surrounding area. However, this is still more intensive than any alternative in the EIR and therefore requires recirculation of the EIR. [Combined with BO20 and BO29]	4-5

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
CENTRAL MOUNTAIN						
CM10	RL80	SR4 (Moderate)	RL40	SR4 (Minor)	The potential alternative designation is proposed subject to approval of Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) 20857 for this property. A preliminary notice of approval has been issued for a three-lot TPM; however, the approval is still subject to appeal. The potential alternative designation of SR4. The request may be recategorized as a Minor level of change if the TPM receives final approval prior to the adoption of the General Plan Update. The density of SR4 was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board; however, it was considered as a cumulative project and once TPM 20857 receives final approval, the map will be able to finalize regardless of the General Plan designation. Therefore, showing the property as SR4 would simply be reflecting the parcelization that will result from TPM 20857. This is similar to the treatment of other tentatively approved subdivisions as discussed in Issue 25 of the March 16 staff report. However, should the TPM not be approved prior to adoption of the General Plan Update, it is suggested that the site continue to be designated at RL80 unless the EIR is modified.	4-7
CM15	RL80	SR1 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL80. The request would result in a spot designation, an inconsistency with the Groundwater Ordinance, and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat and high wildfire risk.	N/A
CREST DEHESA						
CD12	RL80	SR4 (Major)	RL80	none	The property is surrounded by RL80 and open space. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area and increase development potential in a remote location with no road access, very high fire risk, high quality habitat, and steep slopes.	N/A
CD13	RL20	SR4 (Moderate)	SR10	SR10 (Minor)	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL40 and SR10. The request may be found consistent with the project objectives but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. SR10 could be considered as an alternative and would be preferred if CD4 is recommended by the Board. However, it should be noted that due to steep slopes on the site this designation may not result in a different yield than the recommended RL20.	4-8, 5-28 to 5-31

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
CD14	SR4/RL20	SR2/SR4 (Moderate)	SR4/RL20	SR1/RL20 (Minor)	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR. Any higher unit yield than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. Therefore, a possible alternative would be a change in designations, but in a manner that does not substantially increase overall unit yield.	4-9
DESERT						
DS8	VR2	VR4.3 (Moderate)	VR4.3	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was SR4. The request may be found consistent with the project objectives and was evaluated in the EIR. However, similar parcels are not proposed for the same density. Therefore, to provide consistent mapping, additional parcels would be required to receive the same designation and those were not evaluated in the EIR. The original mapping principles mainly applied Village densities in Borrego to existing parcelization. In a few cases, VR2 was applied to undeveloped land adjacent to village densities but in no locations was a density as high as VR4.3 applied to undeveloped land.	5-32
DS11	RL40	RL20 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and public lands. The request would result in a spot designation that is not consistent with similar lands and would not be supported by the project objectives because of its remoteness. In general RL20 is not used east of the CWA except when reflecting existing parcelization.	5-33 to 5-37
DS12	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in an inconsistency with the Groundwater Ordinance, create a spot designation, and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because of its remoteness.	N/A
DS20	VR2	VR4.3 (Moderate)	VR2	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. In general, village densities were only applied areas of existing parcelization. In a few cases such as this, VR2 was applied to undeveloped land adjacent to village densities. VR4.3 was not used for any of these areas so application of VR4.3 in this circumstance may necessitate reviewing all areas proposed as VR2 and other undeveloped land adjacent to village areas. As a result, any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
DS24	SR10	SR1 (Moderate)	SR10	SR2/RL40 (Minor)	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. Therefore, a possible alternative would be a change in designations but in a manner that does not substantially increase overall unit yield.	4-10, 5-38

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
DS25	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area and increase development potential in a remote location.	5-39
DS26	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in an inconsistency with the Groundwater Ordinance, create a spot designation, and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because of its remoteness.	N/A
FALLBROOK						
FB2	RL20	SR2 (Major)	RL20	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL40. The property is surrounded by RL40 and RL20. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat and steep slopes.	N/A
FB3-B	Various	Reflect proposed project (Moderate)	Various	Limited Impact Industrial to General Commercial (Minor)	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Additionally, a project is currently being processed for this site with DPLU and should the General Plan Update be revised to reflect that project, CEQA requires evaluating the whole of the action. An alternative would be limiting the change to replacing the Industrial designated area with a Commercial designation.	4-11
FB4	SR10	VCMU (Moderate)	VCMU	General Commercial (Minor)	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was for the entire area to be SR10. General Commercial was subsequently included in the Staff Recommendation. The request for an additional area of VCMU may be found consistent with the project objectives, but not the current text of the General Plan and implementation of the Village Core Mixed Use designation. A further land use change would be an expanded General Commercial designation and some residential uses could be allowed through zoning. However, additional commercial uses are not supported by the Fallbrook Community Planning Group.	4-12, 5-40 to 5-44

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
FB8	RL40	SR10/RL20 (Major)	SR10/RL20	RL20 (Minor)	The property is surrounded by RL20, SR10, and SR2. The request would provide designations consistent with the adjacent designations, but the 530-acre site has substantially different characteristics than the surrounding area, such as larger parcels, very high quality habitat, steep slopes, and constrained access. A pipelined Tentative Map for this area had to be withdrawn due to these constraints. The entire site meets the criteria for Rural Lands and because it is within the CWA, the use of RL20 is fairly common. Additionally, higher densities were considered as part of the Referral Map in the EIR; therefore, recirculation of the EIR is not considered necessary.	4-13, 5-45 to 5-51
FB16	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
FB17	SR2	SR1 (Moderate)	SR2	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
FB18	RL40	SR10 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and RL20. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would result in an "upzone" compared to the current zoning accommodating more intensive development compared with the surrounding area. The current zoning of the property has a 40-acre minimum lot size. Therefore, even RL20 could be an increase, and such an increase would not be consistent with the mapping for this area which is intended to reduce development potential.	N/A
FB19	RL20	SR10 (Moderate)	RL20	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely affect additional parcels and require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
FB20	RL20	SR4 (Moderate)	RL20	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely affect additional parcels and require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
FB21	RL20	SR4 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL20. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote, Rural designated area.	5-52 to 5-54
FB22	RL20	SR4 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL20. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote, Rural designated area.	5-55 to 5-57
FB23	RL20	SR4 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL20. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote, Rural designated area.	5-58 to 5-60
FB24	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL20/RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in an area disconnected from other semi-rural areas and not adjacent to a Village. The site is constrained by biological resources on the north half and steep slopes on the southern half. Existing zoning for the site has minimum lot sizes of 8 and 10 acres. Therefore, the request would be inconsistent with the mapping of this area which was intended to reduce development potential due to the factors already mentioned.	N/A
FB25	RL20	SR10 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL20. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote, Rural designated area.	N/A
FB26	RL20	SR1 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL20. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would result in an "upzone" compared to the current zoning, accommodating more intensive development compared with the surrounding area.	N/A
FB27	SR2	SR1 (Moderate)	SR2	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would result in a spot designation and likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
JAMUL DULZURA						
JD2	RL20	RL20/SR1/ SR2 (Major)	RL20/SR1/ SR2	Limited SR1 (Minor)	The property is surrounded by RL20, SR1, and open space. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would expand on an island of development that is distant from any village, jobs, and services in an area that has high biological value. An alternative is possible where the adjacent SR1 could be extended onto the property in a manner that connects the existing development rather than extending the development pattern further into the rural lands.	4-14
JD3	RL40	SR10/RL20 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and SR10 and encompasses approximately 1800 acres. The request would not be supported by the project objectives because it would result in greater development potential in a remote area with limited access (including a long dead end road), steep slopes, and very high quality habitat. The property is located outside the CWA where properties meeting the description of Rural Lands are typically given RL40, rather than RL20. The surrounding properties that received the SR10 designation are existing parcels of that size Approximately 42 acres under the same ownership have been designated SR10 on the PC/Staff Recommended land use map.	5-61 to 5-66
JD10	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, has high wildfire risk, and is highly constrained by steep slopes.	N/A
JD11	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and SR10. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, has high wildfire risk, and is constrained by steep slopes. The area nearby that received the SR10 designation has existing parcels much smaller than those of the request area.	N/A
JD12	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and SR10. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, has high wildfire risk, and is constrained by steep slopes. The area nearby that received the SR10 designation has existing parcels much smaller than those of the request area.	N/A

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
JD13	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	SR10	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely affect additional parcels and require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
JD15	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, has high wildfire risk, and is constrained by steep slopes. The area nearby that received the SR10 designation has existing parcels smaller than the request area.	N/A
JULIAN						
JL5	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	SR10	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
LAKESIDE						
LS6	SR2	SR1/RL20 (Moderate)	SR2	SR1/RL20 (Minor)	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher unit yield than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. Therefore, a possible alternative would be a change in designations, but in a manner that does not increase overall unit yield.	4-15
LS7-A	SR4	Medium Impact Industrial (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
LS24	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and public lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that is not near other development, has high wildfire risk with limited to no access on a dead-end road, and is constrained by steep slopes.	N/A
LS25	SR4	VR2 (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
LS26	SR10	SR4 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by SR10 and RL40. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would retain development potential in area that has high wildfire risk with access on a dead-end road. In this area of the recommended map, some SR2 is found. However, this is reflecting existing parcelization and is not for future development potential. Similarly, the SR10 on the request area and surrounding properties is recognizing the existing parcelization.	N/A
LS27	VR4.3	VR7.3 (Moderate)	VR4.3	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
LS28	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and public lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, has very high wildfire risk, and is constrained by steep slopes.	N/A
LS29	RL20	SR4 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL20 and public lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, has high wildfire risk, and is constrained by steep slopes.	N/A
MOUNTAIN EMPIRE						
ME3	RL20	SR10 (Major)	RL20	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL80. The property is surrounded by tribal and public lands. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation distant from any other Semi-Rural lands or Village. SR10 is only used east of the CWA to reflect existing parcelization.	5-67 to 5-72
ME14	RL80	SR4 (Major)	RL80	none	The property is surrounded by RL80. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area.	N/A

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
ME16	RL80	SR4 (Major)	RL80	none	The property is surrounded by RL80. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area. Designations in the area of this request are mainly reflecting existing parcel patterns and sizes.	N/A
ME17	RL80	SR4/RL40 (Major)	RL80	none	The property is surrounded by RL80 and public lands. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place additional development potential away from the Village Center, distant from jobs and infrastructure. Application of the SR4 designation would be inconsistent for areas east of the CWA where semi-rural designations are only applied to reflect existing parcels. RL40 is proposed for land to the southwest of this request. However, these properties are smaller in size and located closer to the community center.	N/A
ME18	RL40	RL20 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation, would be different from the designation given to similar nearby properties, and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because of its remoteness, high quality habitat, high wildfire risk, and steep slopes. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles. RL20 is mainly only used east of the CWA to reflect existing parcelization.	5-73 to 5-78
ME19	RL80	Neighborhood Commercial (Major)	RL80	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and RL80. The request would not be consistent with the project objectives, but most of the desired uses by the property owner are likely achievable by retaining the current zoning.	N/A
ME20	S90 Zoning	M54 Zoning (Moderate)	RL40	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL40. The area is now shown to retain its Industrial designation but is given a S90 holding designation because the site is in a Special Study Area and the Industrial designation was not evaluated as part of the EIR on this property. The request may be found consistent with the project objectives but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any different zoning than Rural Residential or S90 would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
ME21	RL80	SPA/SR4 (Major)	RL80	none	The property is surrounded by RL80 and public lands. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place additional development potential away from the Village Center, distant from jobs and infrastructure. The Request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report and subsequent reports as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-79 to 5-85

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
ME22	RL80	SR4 (Major)	RL80	none	The property is surrounded by RL80 and public lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area.	N/A
ME23	SR10	SR1 (Moderate)	SR10 / General Commercial	none	Already compromised. The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. However, this property is included in a Special Study Area and will likely be reevaluated through that process.	N/A
ME24	RL80	SR4 (Major)	RL80	none	The property is surrounded by RL80. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area.	N/A
ME25	RL80	SR4 (Major)	RL80	none	The property is surrounded by RL80. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area.	N/A
ME26	RL20	SR10 (Moderate)	RL20	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would result in a spot designation and likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
ME27	RL40	SR10 (Moderate)	RL40	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
ME28	SR10	SR4 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by SR10 and public lands. The request would be inconsistent with the Groundwater Ordinance, result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would increase development potential in an area distant from an existing Village.	N/A
ME29	SR10	SR4 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by SR10, RL80 and public lands. The request would be inconsistent with the Groundwater Ordinance, result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would increase development potential in an area distant from an existing Village.	N/A

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
ME30-A	RL40	SR4 (Moderate)	RL40	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
ME30-B	RL40/SR10	SR4 (Major)	RL40/SR10	none	The property is surrounded by SR10, RL40 and public lands. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would result in a spot designation and increase development potential in an area distant from an existing Village.	N/A
NORTH COUNTY METRO						
NC3-A	RL20	SR4 (Major)	RL20	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL40. The property is surrounded by RL20 and open space. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains steep slopes. While SR1 appears nearby, the property is separated from that area by a prominent ridgeline.	N/A
NC12	RL40	SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation, would be different from the designation given to similar nearby properties, and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because of its remoteness, high quality habitat, high wildfire risk, and steep slopes. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-86 to 5-91
NC13	RL40	SR2 (Major)	SR4	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and public lands. The request would be different from the designation given to similar nearby properties and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because of its remoteness, high quality habitat, high wildfire risk, and steep slopes. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-92 to 5-97
NC14	RL20	Rural Commercial (Major)	RC	none	The property is surrounded by RL20 and SPA. The request would not be supported by the project objectives to assign land uses according to the characteristics of the land. The site is entirely constrained by either wetlands or steep slopes. Also, new commercial land uses would be assigned away from Village areas, which is not consistent with the Community Development Model. With the steep terrain on the property, the provision of nearly 30 acres of commercial land uses would require extensive grading, complicating compliance with the I-15 design guidelines.	5-98

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
NC16	RL40	SR2 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and open space. The request would result in a spot designation, would be different from the designation given to similar nearby properties, and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area.	N/A
NC17	SR1	VR2 (Major)	VR2	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was SR10. SR1 is an "upzone" over the existing General Plan. The property is surrounded by SR2. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would increase development potential away from the Village, which is inconsistent with anything surrounding it.	5-99
NC18-A	SR2	SR1 (Major)	SR1	none	The property is surrounded by SR1 and SR2. The request would be inconsistent with the County's fire response travel time standard and would not be supported by the project objectives. The property was originally recommended at SR1 but after analysis of the fire travel time and consultation with the local fire district, the recommended designation was changed to SR2. It should be noted that the existing designation has a 1du/10ac density so the property is receiving a substantial "upzone" in either case.	See March 16 Report
NC22	SR10	SR2 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by SR10 and SR2. The adjacent SR2 areas are already parcelized at that density. The request includes an area with much larger parcels and SR2 would be inconsistent with the designation given to similar nearby parcels. The request would not be supported by the project objectives because it would place additional development potential away from the Village Center, in an area with steep slopes and high quality habitat. On April 2, 2002, the DPLU Director wrote a letter to San Marcos explaining that this proposal was not consistent with the County's General Plan Update.	See March 16 Report
NC27/ NC36	SR1	VR4.3 (Moderate)	VR2	VR2 (Minor)	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. A possible alternative is VR2 which is consistent with alternatives evaluated in EIR. The recommendation of SR1 resulted from earlier correspondence from the City of Vista that indicated that they would prefer a lower density due to limited sewer capacity. The City Council later heard from the property owners in the area and supported their request for 4 du/ac.	4-16, 5-100

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
NC37	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	SR10	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
NC38	SR2	SR1 (Moderate)	SR2	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. The designation currently recommended is consistent with the existing designation on the property. The request is for an "upzone."	N/A
NC40	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, and is highly constrained by steep slopes.	N/A
NC41	SR2	SR1 (Moderate)	SR2	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. The designation currently recommended is consistent with the existing designation on the property. The request is for an "upzone."	N/A
NC42	SR10/RL20	VR/SR4 (Major)	SR10/RL20	Various (Moderate)	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was SR10/RL40. The property is 1,516 acres recommended now at SR10/RL20. A potential land use change to allow for some village residential and SR4 could be applied; however, this approach has not been evaluated in the EIR.	4-17
NC46	SR2	SR1 (Moderate)	SR1	none	This request should have been classified as a Major change because it does not meet County fire response travel time standards. The property is surrounded by SR1 and SR2. The request would be inconsistent with the County's fire response travel time standard and not be supported by the project objectives. The recommended density of SR2 still results in some "upzoning" of this property.	See NC18-A
NC48	SR2	SR1 (Moderate)	SR2	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. The designation currently recommended is consistent with the existing designation on the property. The request is for an "upzone."	N/A

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
NORTH MOUNTAIN						
NM8	RL80	SR4 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by tribal lands. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that had no access, contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, has high wildfire risk, and is constrained by steep slopes. The property request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report and subsequent reports as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-101 to 5-106
NM15	RL80	RL40 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL80 and open space. The request would not be consistent with the treatment of similar nearby lands and would not be supported by the project objectives because it would place additional development potential away from the Village Center, distant from jobs and infrastructure. The property is adjacent to Santa Ysabel but this is mainly a tourist supported crossroads with no significant community infrastructure. Therefore, RL80 has been applied to all of the larger land holdings in this area with other designations only used to recognize existing parcels and development.	N/A
NM16	RL20/RL80	SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL80. The request would not be consistent with the treatment of similar nearby lands and would not be supported by the project objectives because it would place additional development potential away from the Village Center, distant from jobs and infrastructure. A portion of this property request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as being inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-107 to 5-114
PALA PAUMA						
PP1	RL40/RL80	SR10 (Major)	RL40/RL80	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL80. The property is surrounded by RL80. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, and is highly constrained by steep slopes. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-115 to 5-119

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
PP12	RL40	RL20 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and RL20. The nearby RL20 recognizes existing smaller parcels. The request would not be supported by the project objectives because it would increase development potential on a remote property that is highly constrained by steep slopes and contains high quality habitat. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles. In addition, this property had an associated pipelined Tentative Map (TM 5321) which was denied by the Planning Commission on 1/8/2010.	5-120 to 5-124
PP15	RL40	SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL80. The property is adjacent to RL80, SR10, and tribal lands. The nearby SR10 recognizes existing smaller parcels. The request would not be supported by the project objectives because it would increase development potential on a remote property that is highly constrained by steep slopes and contains high quality habitat.	5-125 to 5-131
PP16	RL20	SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL40. The property is surrounded mostly by RL40. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote rural designated area. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-132 to 5-136
PP17	SR10	SR4 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by SR10, RL40 and tribal lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would increase development potential in an area distant from an existing village. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles. In addition this site is currently processing a Tentative Map application (TM 5223) submitted December 18, 2009 for 44 residential lots.	5-137 to 5-141
PP18	RL40	SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat.	N/A
PP19-A	RL40	SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and tribal lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area that contains steep slopes, has limited access, and high wildfire risk. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-142 to 5-146

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
PP19-B	RL40	SR4 or SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and tribal lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area that contains steep slopes, has limited access, and high wildfire risk. Adjacent to PP19-A, which is similar to this property, was a 2003 Residential Referral.	N/A
PP23	RL80	RL40 (Major)	RL40	none	Already compromised. This property was initially recommended at RL160. The request encompasses 15,500 acres of remote ranching land with extremely high biological value, high wildfire risk, limited access, and some steep slopes. Therefore, the request would not be supported by the project objectives and it would be inconsistent to provide this property with RL40 while others receive RL80. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-147 to 5-152
PP29	RL40	RL20 (Major)	RL40	none	Already compromised. Property was initially recommended as RL80 but changed to RL40 in 2003. The property is surrounded by SR10, open space, and tribal lands. The request would not be supported by the project objectives because it would be an "upzone", increasing development potential in a remote rural designated area. This property was a 2003 Residential Referral where the same property owner requested a RL40 designation, which was ultimately recommended by staff.	5-153 to 5-157
PP30	RL40	SR2/SR4 (Major)	RL40	RL20 (Moderate)	The property is surrounded mostly by SR10 and tribal lands. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would increase development potential in an area distant from an existing village and in excess of the surrounding lands. An alternative designation of RL20 may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board.	4-18
PP31	RL40	SR4/SSA (Major)	RL20/RL40	SSA only (Minor)	The property is surrounded by RL40 and tribal lands. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural-designated area that contains steep slopes and high habitat value. The request included application of a Special Study Area (SSA). The SSA only could be applied, but the intent of the SSA would need to be written differently (see draft language on Page 4-20).	4-19 and 4-20

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
PP33	RL20	SR4 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL20 and tribal lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area that contains steep slopes, has limited access, high habitat value and high wildfire risk.	N/A
PP34	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area that contains steep slopes.	N/A
PENDELTON DELUZ						
PD1	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat and has limited access.	5-158
PD4	RL40	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat.	5-158
RAMONA						
RM1	RL80	SR4 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL80. The request would result in inconsistent treatment of similar parcels and a spot designation. It would not be supported by the project objectives because it would increase development potential in a remote area with steep slopes and high wildfire risk.	N/A
RM5	RL80	RL40 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL80 and public lands. The request would result in inconsistent treatment of similar parcels and a spot designation. It would not be supported by the project objectives because it would increase development potential in a remote area with steep slopes, high value habitat and high wildfire risk. The property is near RL40 lands; however, in this area the RL40 is applied to those lands that have greater existing development and parcelization. These features serve to demarcate the transition from RL40 to RL80. Extending RL40 to the subject property blurs that demarcation and may necessitate reconsideration of most RL80 areas.	N/A

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
RM7	RL40	SR10 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and RL80. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area that has high wildfire risk and high habitat value.	N/A
RM16	RL40	SR10 (Moderate)	RL40	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
RM18	SR10/RL40	SR4 (Moderate)	SR10/RL40	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
RM20	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	SR10	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
RM21	SR10	SR4 (Moderate)	SR10	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
RM22	RL80	RL40 (Major)	RL40	none	The property is surrounded by RL40, RL80 and public lands. The request would result in inconsistent treatment of similar parcels. It would not be supported by the project objectives because it would increase development potential in a remote area with high value habitat and high wildfire risk. Although an adjacent area is assigned a RL40 designation, this area is composed of smaller parcels. In this area the RL40 is applied to those lands that have greater existing development and parcelization. These features serve to demarcate the transition from RL40 to RL80. Extending RL40 to the subject property blurs that demarcation and may necessitate reconsideration of most RL80 areas.	N/A

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
SAN DIEGUITO						
SD2	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR. Any higher density than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR. The request was identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles. However, since then most of the request area has been purchased for open space.	5-159 to 5-163
SD4	RL20	SR2 (Major)	SR2	none	The property is surrounded by RL20. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a remote Rural designated area that contains high wildfire risk and contains high habitat value. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-164 to 5-168
SD6	RL20/SR4	SR2 (Major)	SR2	none	Already compromised. Originally the site was designated entirely as SR10; however, the designation was changed to half as SR4 and half as RL20 as a compromise. The entire site is considered highly valuable from a biological perspective because it contains sensitive habitat and provides an important linkage between County lands and the San Marcos MHCP. The property is adjacent to RL20, SR2, open space, and the City of San Marcos. The request would not be supported by the project objectives.	5-169 to 5-172
SD8	RL20	Various (Major)	Various	none	The property is generally surrounded by RL20 and the City of San Marcos. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place Village and Semi-Rural designations in a Rural designated area that serves as a buffer between other communities, contains steep slopes and provides open space and habitat.	5-173 to 5-176
SD15	SR1	General Commercial or I-1 (Moderate)	SR1	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
SD17	RL20	SR2 (Major)	RL20	Modified SR2/RL20 (Minor)	The request would place additional density in a 100-year floodplain. While the FEMA floodplain has been determined outdated, recent studies indicated that the revised floodplain is not substantially different. However, the SR2/RL20 designations could be revised to reflect the updated floodplain information.	4-21

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
SD20	RL20	SR2 (Moderate)	SR4	SR10 (Minor)	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. SR4 was studied for the area as part of the Referral Map but the area has been identified as having very high biological value. Therefore, to stay consistent with the project objectives, designations that reduce development in this area from the proposed project (SR4) must be considered. The current recommendation provides an SR2 designation in the southwest corner of this "island" while designating the remainder as RL20. This effectively clusters the development potential to a single area of the "island" and reduces potential impacts. If the remainder of the area was returned to SR4, this concept would no longer be achieved. A possible alternative designation is SR10, which is consistent with alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Application of this designation should include the surrounding area also in order to be consistent.	4-22
SD21	SR1	Limited Impact Industrial (Moderate)	SR1	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
VALLEY CENTER						
VC9	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR2	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives and it was evaluated in the EIR. However, it would also result in a spot designation that is inconsistent with the treatment of other similar properties and the Community Development Model. To resolve this inconsistency, additional properties would need to receive the same designation and this was not evaluated in the EIR. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report as inconsistent with the General Plan Concepts and Planning Principles.	5-177 to 5-182
VC11	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR2	none	Already compromised. Property was initially assigned a RL20 designation and the property owner originally requested SR4. The request for SR2 may be found consistent with the project objectives and it was evaluated in the EIR. However, it would also result in a spot designation that is inconsistent with the treatment of other similar properties and the Community Development Model. To resolve this inconsistency, additional properties would need to receive the same designation and this was not evaluated in the EIR.	5-183 to 5-187
VC15	RL20	SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL40. SR10 is not supported by the project objectives because it would place a semi-rural designation on a property with steep slopes, sensitive biological resources, and limited habitat.	5-188 to 5-192

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
VC17	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR2	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives and it was evaluated in the EIR. However, it would also result in a spot designation that is inconsistent with the treatment of other similar properties and the Community Development Model. To resolve this inconsistency, additional properties would need to receive the same designation and this was not evaluated in the EIR. The request was also identified in the September 24, 2003 Board Report and subsequent reports as being problematic for these same reasons.	5-193 to 5-196
VC20-A	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR2	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL20. The request may be found consistent with the project objectives and it was evaluated in the EIR. However, it would also result in a spot designation that is inconsistent with the treatment of other similar properties and the Community Development Model. To resolve this inconsistency, additional properties would need to receive the same designation and this was not evaluated in the EIR.	5-197 to 5-201
VC20-B	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR2	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL20. The request may be found consistent with the project objectives and it was evaluated in the EIR. However, it would also result in a spot designation that is inconsistent with the treatment of other similar properties and the Community Development Model. To resolve this inconsistency, additional properties would need to receive the same designation and this was not evaluated in the EIR. Adjacent to VC20-A, which is similar to this property and was a 2003 Residential Referral.	See VC20A
VC23	RL40	RL20 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL40, RL80 and public lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives due to its remote location and limited access. The site is located close to RL20 to the south; however, a key difference between this parcel and that are is that this parcel is outside the CWA while the other area is not. In general, RL20 is only used outside the CWA to reflect existing parcelization.	5-202 to 5-205
VC26	SR2	Medium Impact Industrial (Major)	Medium Impact Industrial	none	Already compromised. The property is constrained by the floodway and 100-year floodplain. Additional language has been added to the Valley Center Community Plan indicating that this area could be redesignated if circumstances result in the property being outside of the floodway. Currently, the request would not be supported by the project objectives or draft goals and policies because it would designate industrial lands within the floodplain and floodway.	See March 16 Report

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
VC27	SR1	VR2.9 (Major)	VR2.9	none	The property is surrounded by SR2 and SR1. The request, which is an increase in density over the existing General Plan, would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would locate village densities in an isolated spot beyond the defined village. Also, the Village boundary has shrunk as a result of the planning process in an attempt by staff and the Valley Center Community Planning Group to "right-size" the village to accommodate forecasted traffic volumes.	5-206 to 5-212
VC29-A	RL20	SR4 or SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL40. The property is surrounded by RL20 and public lands. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would increase development potential in a remote location with a dead-end road, very high fire risk, high quality habitat, and steep slopes.	5-213 to 5-217
VC29-B	RL20	SR10 (Major)	SR10	none	Already compromised. The original recommendation on this property was RL40. The property is adjacent to SR10, but the request would not be supported by the project objectives because it would increase development potential in a remote location with a dead end road, very high fire risk, high quality habitat, and steep slopes.	5-213 to 5-217
VC50	RL20	SR2 or SR4 (Moderate)	RL20	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
VC51	RL20	SR2 or SR4 (Moderate)	RL20	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
VC52	SR2	Medium Impact Industrial (Major)	SR2	none	Already compromised. The property is constrained by the floodway and 100-year floodplain. Additional language has been added to the Valley Center Community Plan indicating that this area could be redesignated if circumstances result in the property being outside of the floodway. Currently, the request would not be supported by the project objectives or draft goals and policies because it would designate industrial lands within the floodplain and floodway.	See March 16 Report

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
VC53	SR2	Limited Impact Industrial (Major)	SR2	none	Already compromised. Four of the 4.6 acres of this property are within the 100-year floodway, with the remainder within the 100-year floodplain. Additional language has been added to the Valley Center Community Plan indicating that this area could be redesignated if circumstances result in the property being outside of the floodway. The request would not be supported by the project objectives or draft goals and policies because it would designate Industrial lands within the floodway and floodplain.	See March 16 Report and 5-218 to 5-221
VC54	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
VC57	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
VC59	RL20	SR4 (Major)	RL20	none	The property is surrounded by RL40 and open space. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would place a Semi-Rural designation in a Rural designated area that contains high quality habitat, is not near other development, and is highly constrained by steep slopes.	N/A
VC60	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
VC61	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
VC63	SR4	SR1 (Major)	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	The property is surrounded by SR4. The request would result in a spot designation and would not be supported by the project objectives or the Community Development Model because it would result in an "upzone" compared to the current plan and would result in more intensive development compared with the surrounding area. An alternative designation of SR2 is possible for this and the surrounding area but is more intensive than any alternative in the EIR.	4-23

PSR#	PC/Staff Rec	Request (Category)	Highest Intensity Analyzed in EIR	Potential Alternative (Category)	Discussion	Additional Info
VC64	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A
VC66	SR4	SR2 (Moderate)	SR4	none	The request may be found consistent with the project objectives, but would result in a spot designation and was not evaluated in the EIR because it was not a part of a project alternative directed to be studied by the Board. Any higher intensity than what is being recommended would likely require recirculation of the EIR.	N/A